



15 JUN 2007

Robert C. Faber
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York NY 10036-8402

In re Application of	:	
LUPPI et al.	:	
Application No.: 10/593,211	:	
PCT No.: PCT/FR05/00558	:	
Int. Filing: 09 March 2005	:	DECISION ON PETITION
Priority Date: 16 March 2004	:	UNDER 37 CFR 1.47(a)
Attorney Docket No.: P/3255-103	:	
For: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR	:	
STARTING UP A PIPELINE	:	

This decision is issued in response to applicants' "Petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a)" filed 25 January 2007 to accept the application without the signature of joint inventor, Roland Daly. The \$200 petition fee has been submitted.

BACKGROUND

On 09 March 2005, applicants filed international application PCT/FR05/00558 which claimed a priority date 16 March 2004. Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.495, the period for paying the basic national fee in the United States expired 30 months from the priority date, 16 October 2006

On 15 September 2006, applicants filed a transmittal for entry into the national stage in the United States, which accompanied by, inter alia: the requisite basic national fee as required by 35 U.S.C. 371(c)(1); a copy of the international application; and an application data sheet.

On 25 January 2007, applicants filed a petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a).

DISCUSSION

A petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) must be accompanied by: (1) the fee under 37 CFR 1.17, (2) factual proof that the missing joint inventor refuses to execute the application or cannot be reached after diligent effort, (3) a statement of the last known address of the missing inventor, and (4) an oath or declaration by each 37 CFR 1.47(a) applicant on his or her own behalf and behalf of the nonsigning joint inventor. Items (1), (3) and (4) have been satisfied.

Regarding item (2) above, petitioner states that Roland Daly has refused to sign the application. Section 409.03(d) of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (M.P.E.P.), **Proof of Unavailability or Refusal**, states, in part:

Where a refusal of the inventor to sign the application papers is alleged, the circumstances of the presentation of the application papers and of the refusal must be specified in a statement of facts by the person who presented the inventor with the application papers and/or to whom the refusal was made. Statements by a party not present when an oral refusal is made will not be accepted.

Proof that a bona fide attempt was made to present a copy of the application papers (specification, including claims, drawings, and oath or declaration) to the nonsigning inventor for signature, but the inventor refused to accept delivery of the papers or expressly stated that the application papers should not be sent, may be sufficient. When there is an express oral refusal, that fact along with the time and place of the refusal must be stated in the statement of facts. When there is an express written refusal, a copy of the document evidencing that refusal must be made part of the statement of facts. The document may be redacted to remove material not related to the inventor's reasons for refusal.

When it is concluded by the 37 CFR 1.47 applicant that a nonsigning inventor's conduct constitutes a refusal, all facts upon which that conclusion is based should be stated in the statement of facts in support of the petition or directly in the petition. If there is documentary evidence to support facts alleged in the petition or in any statement of facts, such evidence should be submitted. Whenever a nonsigning inventor gives a reason for refusing to sign the application oath or declaration, that reason should be stated in the petition.

A review of the present petition reveals that petitioner has not shown that a bona fide attempt was made to present the application papers (specification, claims, drawings and oath/declaration) to Roland Daly. The declaration of Gilles Degremont states that a declaration and assignment were mailed to Roland Daly on August 3, 2006 and that he (Mr. Daly) subsequently refused to execute the documents. However, it is unclear from the present petition and accompanying documents whether Roland Daly has been presented with a complete copy of the application papers as required. The mailing of the declaration/assignment is not considered a complete copy of the application. As stated above, where a refusal of the inventor to sign the application papers is alleged, a statement of facts is needed from a person having first hand knowledge of the facts that a complete copy of the application papers (specification, claims, drawings and declaration) were sent to Mr. Daly, and when such papers were sent. In addition, copies of documentary evidence such as a certified mail return receipt, cover letter of instruction, telegrams, etc., should be supplied with the declaration.


For the reasons stated above, it would not be appropriate to accept the application without the signature of Roland Daly under 37 CFR 1.47(a) at this time.

CONCLUSION

The petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) is **DISMISSED** without prejudice.

If reconsideration on the merits of this petition is desired, a proper response must be filed within **TWO (2) MONTH** from the mail date of this decision. Any reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition Under 37 CFR 1.47(a)." No additional petition fee is required.

Any further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed to:
Mail Stop PCT, Commissioner for Patents, Office of PCT Legal Administration,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, with the contents of the letter marked to
the attention of the Office of PCT Legal Administration.



Anthony Smith
Attorney-Advisor
Office PCT Legal Administration
Tel.: 571-272-3298
Facsimile: 571-273-0459